

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS
OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lewis of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2643 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

TITLE VII—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 701. The effective date of section 115 of this Act and of title VI of this Act shall be the day that the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Energy Information Administration, certifies that nothing in this Act—

(1) shall reduce the amount of domestic energy available from the public lands of the United States;

(2) shall result in the increased imports of any energy otherwise available from the public lands of the United States; or

(3) shall result in higher costs, to Federal agencies funded in this Act, for gasoline, natural gas or home heating oil.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, no issue in this bill is more important than our striving towards energy independence, and to discuss that by way of our motion to recommit, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), my colleague who is an expert on energy policy.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I did make my living in oil and gas. I never owned one oil and gas well; but I will tell you, we went down holes. We were plumbers, and we fixed the oil wells and so I have seen the cost and difficulty of producing energy from a very close point of view. My wife and I employed 50 people in a small company that simply repaired oil weapons.

Reasonable people can have different points of view, but I have watched the trajectory of the Democrat energy bills, first H.R. 6, the energy bill that came through our Resources Committee and now this Interior Appropriations. And I will tell you that from my point of view, the Democratic energy agenda is anti-American energy. It insists that we import more. It is going to send more jobs to China and it is going to make life harder for Americans.

The motion to recommit simply says let's have the secretary certify. If you reasonably believe that I am wrong about my assumptions, we are going to

send this back to the secretary to certify that nothing in this bill will reduce the amount of domestic energy or result in increased imports. I think if you believe in your bill, you should not be afraid to cause that review by the secretary and that certification that we are going to protect consumers. Because every one of us hear from consumers every day, our constituents, that the price of gasoline is too high. It is too high because of the policies that we in America, we in this American government have caused.

Section 115 is a very simple section. It is the only research and development section for ultra-deep oil. I can tell you that the deeper you go, the more expensive oil is to get. And it is not for the big companies, it is for the small companies that can't have research and development. The only research and development money that is available for small companies is in section 115. It has been taken out of every other section.

Shale oil is title VI. Shale oil is two times all the reserves of oil and gas in the entire world. Two times. It would make us self-sufficient, and yet we are removing shale oil.

My friends, these are the reasons that I believe the policies that are being promoted are anti-American and pro-import, will send jobs to China, and will make life harder for Americans.

The Washington Post, in review of the very first shot of this Democrat energy agenda, H.R. 6, The Washington Post said, "This is something Hugo Chavez would be proud of."

My friends, we are not on a track to make life easier for Americans; we are on a track to make life very difficult for the American economy and the American consumer.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, if the motion uses the word "promptly," as this one does, it takes the bill off the floor and sends it back to the Appropriations Committee. The committee is not required to act because the instructions are considered merely advisory to the committee. In other words, by using the word "promptly," they would kill the bill.

Now this motion to recommit is simply a device to protect excess profits of the energy companies. It does this by overturning section 115 of the bill. This section simply requires energy companies who are realizing \$9 billion of excess profits to renegotiate the faulty leases which were signed in 1997 and 1998. In legal terms, this is called "unjust enrichment" at the expense of the taxpayers.

The motion overturns section 115 by delaying it until impossible conditions are met, as certified by the secretary. If this language is adopted, these enor-

mous unjustified profits will continue for an industry making tens of billions of dollars of profit.

Adoption of the amendment would kill the bill and with so many good things in it, I urge all Members to vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX and the order of the House of June 26, 2007, the Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 186, nays 233, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

YEAS—186

Aderholt	Flake	McCrery
Akin	Forbes	McHenry
Alexander	Fortenberry	McHugh
Bachmann	Fossella	McKeon
Bachus	Fox	McMorris
Baker	Franks (AZ)	Rodgers
Barrett (SC)	Gallely	McNerney
Bartlett (MD)	Garrett (NJ)	Mica
Barton (TX)	Gillmor	Miller (FL)
Biggart	Gingrey	Miller (MI)
Billray	Gohmert	Miller, Gary
Bilirakis	Goode	Moran (KS)
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Murphy, Tim
Blackburn	Granger	Musgrave
Blunt	Graves	Myrick
Bonner	Hastert	Neugebauer
Bono	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Boozman	Hayes	Paul
Boren	Heller	Pearce
Boustany	Hensarling	Pence
Brady (TX)	Herger	Peterson (PA)
Brown (SC)	Hobson	Petri
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Pickering
Ginny	Hulshof	Pitts
Buchanan	Hunter	Platts
Burgess	Inglis (SC)	Poe
Burton (IN)	Issa	Porter
Buyer	Jindal	Price (GA)
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)
Camp (MI)	Jones (NC)	Putnam
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Radanovich
Cannon	Keller	Regula
Cantor	King (IA)	Rehberg
Capito	King (NY)	Renzi
Carter	Kingston	Reynolds
Chabot	Kline (MN)	Rogers (AL)
Coble	Knollenberg	Rogers (KY)
Cole (OK)	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Conaway	LaHood	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Cubin	Lampson	Roskam
Culberson	Latham	Royce
Davis, David	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Tom	Lewis (CA)	Sali
Deal (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Schmidt
Dent	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lungren, Daniel	Shimkus
Doolittle	E.	Shuster
Drake	Mack	Simpson
Dreier	Manzullo	Smith (NE)
Duncan	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Ehlers	Marshall	Souder
Emerson	Matheson	Stearns
English (PA)	McCarthy (CA)	Sullivan
Everett	McCaul (TX)	Tancredo
Fallin	McCotter	Terry